

REMARKS

Claims 1-22 are pending in the present application, were examined, and stand rejected. In response, Applicants amend Claims 1, 3, 5-8, 11 and 20 and cancel Claims 10, 12-13, 15-19 and 21-22. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of pending Claims 1-9, 11, 14 and 20, as amended, and in view of at least the following remarks.

I. Claims Rejected Under 35 U.S.C. §112

The Examiner objected to Claims 6, 15 and 21 because of informalities and rejected Claims 2-3 and 5-14 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicants regard as the invention.

In response, Claims 1, 3, 5-6 and 8 are amended without the addition of new matter. In addition, Claims 10, 12-13, 15, 19 and 21-22 are cancelled. Accordingly, in view of Applicants' amendments to Claims 1, 3, 5-6 and 13, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the rejection of Claims 2-3, 5, 11 and 13-14 and the objection to Claim 6.

II. Claims Rejected Under 35 U.S.C. §102(a)

The Examiner rejected Claims 5-7, 9, 14-16, 18-19, and 20-22 under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,076,088 issued to Paik et al. ("Paik"). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Regarding Claims 5 and 20, Claims 5 and 20 are amended to include the allowable subject matter of Claim 13, as indicated by the Examiner, as well as intervening Claims 10 and 12. Accordingly, in view of Applicants' amendments to Claims 5 and 20 to include the allowable subject matter indicated by the Examiner, Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 5 and 20, as amended, are patentable over Paik as well as the references of record. Consequently, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the §102(a) rejection of Claims 5 and 20.

Regarding Claims 6, 7, 9 and 14, Claims 6, 7, 9 and 14 depend from Claim 5 and therefore include the patentable claim features of Claim 5, as described above. Accordingly, 6, 7, 9 and 14 are also patentable over the references of record based on their dependency from

Claim 5. Consequently, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the §102(a) rejection of Claims 6, 7, 9 and 14.

III. Claims Rejected Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

The Examiner rejected Claims 1-4, 8, 10-12 and 17 35 under U.S.C 103(a) as being unpatentable over Paik in view of U.S. No. 6,081,774 issued to deHita et al. ("deHita").

Regarding Claim 1, Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Applicants respectfully submit that Claim 1 includes the following claimed features, which are neither taught nor suggested by Paik:

wherein the semantic relevance ($S(x,y)$) is a distance from a node x to another node y in the thesaurus system and can be express as:

$$S(x,y) = \frac{1}{1 + d(x,y)}$$

where $d(x,y)$ is a distance between the nodes x and y in the thesaurus system, and

$d(x,y)$, i.e., the distance from the node x to the node y in the thesaurus system, is 0 if the node y is one of lower nodes and is computed as the number of edges between the nodes if otherwise.

As correctly pointed out by the Examiner, Paik fails to teach an interactive processing means for outputting a sentence format rule for which failure data from the input sentence analyzing means is corrected depending on the standardized formats of sentence structure and semantic structure, and indexing and searching result, as required by Claim 1.

deHita teaches an information retrieval system that represents the content of a language-based database being searched as well as the user's natural language query, in which common spelling mistakes are corrected. (see col. 17 lines 46-53.)

Hence incorporation of the teachings of deHita within Paik would merely enable Paik to correct common misspelling errors, as taught by deHita. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submits that the Examiner fails to illustrate a teaching or suggestion within Paik in view of deHita to semantic structure processing means for computing semantic relevance to search supply information and document most semantically relevant to the requested information specification; wherein the semantic relevance ($S(x,y)$) is a distance from a node x to another node y in the thesaurus system, as required by Claim 1.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submits that Claim 1, based on the features described above, is patentable over Paik, deHita and the references of record. Consequently, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the Section 103(a) rejection of Claim 1.

Regarding Claims 2-4, Claim 2-4 depend from Claim 1 and therefore include the patentable features of Claim 1 as described above. Accordingly, Claims 2-4, based on their dependency from Claim 1, are also patentable over Paik, deHita and the references of record. Consequently, Applicants respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the 103(a) rejections of Claims 2-4.

Regarding Claim 11, Claim 11 depends from Claim 5 and therefore includes the patentable features of Claim 1 as described above. Applicants respectfully submit that the Examiner's citing of deHita fails to introduce a teaching or suggestion regarding semantic structural analysis, as required by Claim 5. Accordingly, Claim 5, is patentable over Paik, deHita and the references of record. Therefore, Claim 11, based on its dependency from Claim 5, is also patentable over Paik, deHita and the references of record. Consequently, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the 103(a) rejections of Claim 11.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, it is submitted that Claims 1-22, as amended, patentably define the subject invention over the cited references of record, and are in condition for allowance and such action is earnestly solicited at the earliest possible date. If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would be useful in moving the case forward, he is encouraged to contact the undersigned at (310) 207-3800.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2666 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §§1.16 or 1.17, particularly, extension of time fees.

Respectfully submitted,

BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR, & ZAFMAN LLP


Dated: May 27, 2004

By: 
Joseph Lutz, Reg. No. 43,765

12400 Wilshire Boulevard
Seventh Floor
Los Angeles, California 90025
(310) 207-3800

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING:

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail, with sufficient postage, in an envelope addressed to: Mail Stop Amendment, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450, on May 27, 2004.


Nedy Calderon

5/27/04
Date